

REMARKS

The Non-Final Office Action mailed April 28, 2009 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 106-110, 112-117, 119-127, 129-135 and 137-143 were pending in this application. Claims 111, 118 and 128 were previously cancelled. Through this amendment and response claims 117, 122, 123, 126 and 130-143 are now cancelled. Claims 144-148 have been added. No new subject matter has been added.

Claim Rejections under U.S.C. §102

Claims 106, 108-110, 112, 113, 116-117, 119, 125-127, 129, 130, 131 and 133-135, 137 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent 6,690,417), hereinafter Yoshida. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the Remarks below.

The Office Action asserts that Yoshida discloses a means for changing optical properties of the lens module, for example, based on the rationale that a zoom objective's focal length is controlled by the user and further that the lens could have a moveable barrel for holding zoom lens. Applicants respectfully submit that the camera system in Yoshida is mounted to the interior of the device. Therefore, such an interior moveable barrel cannot be comprised by the "housing" of the device as was recited in the independent claims. To more clearly recite the subject matter of the claimed embodiments, Applicants have amended the claims to recite that the "housing" comprises:

an optical properties changing unit configured to cooperate with the lens module of the camera system so as to enable taking pictures using the camera system with changed optical imaging properties, wherein the unit comprises at least one of the following: a lens, an objective comprising lenses, at least one filter, a diffractive optical element, and combinations thereof.

Applicants respectfully submit that exemplary optical properties changing units have been comprehensively described in the specification with numerous examples including: a slideable unit (paragraph 21), rotatable unit (paragraph 22), a plurality of units (paragraph 23), and a unit with detachable attachment (e.g. snap-in, paragraph 16) to the housing of the mobile terminal device. For instance, paragraph 14 discloses that in one embodiment, the user may decide which size and weight are acceptable for such an extension of the camera system.

Moreover, the recited unit comprises at least one of “a lens, an objective comprising lenses, at least one filter, a diffractive optical element, and combinations thereof.”

Assuming *agruendo*, which Applicants do not admit, that Yoshida did in fact disclose a housing comprising zoom buttons for controlling the focal length of the zoom. In this case, the user could drive the zoom lens of the camera with the buttons to a longer or shorter focal length. However, there would still be only one lens system, *i.e.* the zoom objective integrally included to the camera unit within the device or Yoshida. Thus, there would be no teaching, disclosure, or even suggestion of any optical properties changing unit that could cooperate with the lens module of the camera system and that would comprise a lens, an objective comprising lenses, at least one filter, a diffractive optical element, and combinations thereof.

Further, the recited optical properties changing unit is an optical unit rather than an actuator or controls for adapting the lens module itself. The recited optical properties changing unit is also comprised by the housing. The pending claims do not recite that the housing surrounds the optical properties changing unit, but rather the housing itself comprises the optical properties changing unit. This very feature enables significant advantages not possible with the teachings of Yoshida or any other art of record. By providing the housing with the optical properties changing unit, it is possible to change the optical properties of the camera system simply by changing the housing or a part of the housing that comprises the optical properties changing unit. Hence, pictures can be taken at short distances or of different fields of view (*i.e.*, see paragraph 7 of specification). For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in regards to claims 106, 108-110, 112, 113, 116-117, 119, 125-127, 129, 130, 131 and 133-135, 137.

Claims 120-124 and 143 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0155864), hereinafter Wang. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the Remarks below.

As discussed above, Applicants have more clearly recited the subject matter of the claimed embodiments to indicate that the “housing” comprises:

an optical properties changing unit configured to cooperate with the lens module of the camera system so as to enable taking pictures using the camera system with changed optical

imaging properties, wherein the unit comprises at least one of the following: a lens, an objective comprising lenses, at least one filter, a diffractive optical element, and combinations thereof.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wang (or any other art of record) does not teach, disclose, or suggest the recited subject matter of the rejected claims, and therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection in regards to 106, 108-110, 112, 113, 116-117, 119, 125-127, 129, 130, 131 and 133-135, 137.

Claim Rejections under U.S.C. §103

Claims 107, 114, 115 and 132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Suda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,373,524), hereinafter Suda. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the Remarks below.

Yoshida does not teach, disclose, or suggest at least a “housing” that comprises:

an optical properties changing unit configured to cooperate with the lens module of the camera system so as to enable taking pictures using the camera system with changed optical imaging properties, wherein the unit comprises at least one of the following: a lens, an objective comprising lenses, at least one filter, a diffractive optical element, and combinations thereof.

Applicants further respectfully submit that these deficiencies are not cured by Suda or any other art of record, and therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in regards to claims 107, 114, 115 and 132.

Claims 138-142 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Wang. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the Remarks below.

As discussed in more detail above, neither Yoshida, Wang, nor any art of record teaches, discloses, or suggests at least a “housing” that comprises:

an optical properties changing unit configured to cooperate with the lens module of the camera system so as to enable taking pictures using the camera system with changed optical imaging properties, wherein the unit comprises at least one of the following: a lens, an objective comprising lenses, at least one filter, a diffractive optical element, and combinations thereof.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in regards to claims 138-142.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims. Please feel free to contact the undersigned should any questions arise with respect to this case that may be addressed by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: July 28, 2009

By: /Shawn P. Gorman/
Shawn P. Gorman
Reg. No. 56,197
Ten South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001